Ibrahim Kaypakkaya on the 50th Anniversary of his Murder
RECKONING, RUPTURE AND A NEW PATH

Communist Party of Turkey – Marxist Leninist (TKP-ML)
Central Committee
January 2023

www.tkpml.com

He was imprisoned with "a torn and patched brown cap on his head, a local military parka on his back, a jacket, sweater... three pairs of pants worn on top of each other, a pair of socks made of white wool and knitted by hand in the villages and nylon socks on his feet, a pair of size 45 Çelik rubber shoes. "1

The year 2023 marks the 50th anniversary of the murder of communist leader İbrahim Kaypakkaya by the Turkish state in Amed Prison. Kaypakkaya was a young communist leader who was murdered at the age of 24, on the night of May 17th to May 18th in 1973, after months of torture.

He was murdered not so much because of what he did, but because he courageously and uncompromisingly defended the truths that had been ignored and had not been systematically analyzed, voiced and explained with a Marxist-Leninist-Maoist perspective and revolutionary perspective up until that moment in time.. He was subjected to the most severe torture and murdered because he and his comrades founded the Party and the Army, which were the most important means of putting his discourse into practice and which were described in MIT reports as "the most dangerous organization of revolutionary communism in Turkey. "2

His "most dangerous communist views" included his ideas on fundamental issues such as the reality and structure of the Turkish state, the history of the Republic, the fascist character of the Kemalist government, the existence of the Kurdish nation, the reality of Kurdistan, the right of the Kurdish nation to secede freely, the nature and path of the revolution, the question of alliances and the party.

All their "assets" were these ideas and they bequeathed a great wealth to the oppressed peoples of the Middle East. The pricelessness of this legacy has become even more evident over the years in parallel with the course of the class struggle - as evidenced by the developments that have taken place.

In the intervening period of half a century, Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, with his life and the theses he put forward, continues to be the subject of a twofold interest. One side of this interest is the Turkish ruling classes and their state apparatus, and the other side is the laborers and oppressed peoples.

It is remarkable that even after fifty years, the theses put forward by İbrahim Kaypakkaya inspire and guide the working class and laboring people of Turkey and Turkey Kurdistan, as well as the oppressed nations and nationalities in the Middle East. What does it mean that Kaypakkaya's views, which he shaped in his own historical conditions, in the practice of class struggle and which he wrote down in a very short period of time, are still carried as a flag in the hands of the working class and oppressed peoples after half a century? Why was he, unlike other revolutionary leaders of his time, considered "the most dangerous" by the class enemies? Why, even after half a century, do the Turkish ruling classes still regard him as one of the "most dangerous terrorists"? Why is it that the law enforcement agencies of the Turkish Republic still interfere with the carrying of his picture in rallies and marches, and his name and picture are the subject of criminal cases? Why is there still a gendarmerie outpost next to his grave in a deserted village cemetery in the middle of the Anatolian steppe? Why is the grave of a young communist murdered fifty years ago still feared? Why are those who want to commemorate him at his grave still prevented and subjected to detentions

and arrests? Why, after half a century, have the fears of the Turkish ruling classes not disappeared? Of course, we can keep going with such questions...

On the other hand, the theses put forward by this young communist leader are ignored not only by the Turkish state but also by all kinds of reformist and revisionist circles. This situation is not surprising. Because Kaypakkaya had the audacity to call their "beloved leader" M. Kemal a fascist and went even further and made it clear that "Kemalism and revolutionism cannot coexist" and said "the emperor has no clothes", so to speak.3

The organic intellectuals of the bourgeoisie kept Kaypakkaya apart from other revolutionary leaders and ignored him. When these circles have to make an evaluation of the revolutionaries of the period, they address Kaypakkaya by referring to his "youth", his "peasant revolutionism", his "radicalism" within the conditions of the period, his "Chinese copying", his "not confiding in torture", etc.4

Although fifty years have passed, Kaypakkaya's position is still the same for these circles. He is still ignored, and when they have to, they try to devalue him in various ways. This is actually a good thing! Because it shows that the theses put forward by Kaypakkaya are not open to any class compromise, that his views continue to be too contradictory to be absorbed into the order.

It is understandable that both the Turkish ruling classes continue to see İbrahim Kaypakkaya as a dangerous terrorist and resort to bans and prosecutions, and that all kinds of reformist revisionist circles ignore or try to devalue him. It is understandable because the theses put forward by Kaypakkaya are still up to date and in this sense, he continues to be the "most dangerous of revolutionary communism" for the ruling classes and moreover, the "methods of struggle he envisaged" remain so clear that they cannot be bent or twisted.

Did Kaypakkaya, as a seer of his time, make prophecies about the future? Aside from his other theses, how did he, for example, decipher the true face of Doğu Perinçek, who today, fifty years later, is the spare tire of the AKP-MHP government.5 Was he a genius with supernatural abilities? Was he endowed with a "special talent" by "God"? "6 Was he a fortune teller when he declared that the Kurds were a nation in Turkey at a time when the existence or non-existence of the Kurds was being debated within their own historical conditions, when he predicted that such a movement might develop when there was no Kurdish national liberation movement as there is today, and moreover when he expressed what the communist movement's attitude should be in the face of this situation? And finally, what is the secret of the fact that the theses of this young communist leader have withstood the devastating ravages of time and are still very much relevant today?

The answer to this question is actually very clear and simple: İbrahim Kaypakkaya took part in the practice of the class struggle of the period. He was not satisfied with just practice. He re-synthesized the experience he gained from practice with the science of the international proletariat. His attitude of being revolutionary in practice, combined with the science of the international proletariat, put forward theses that are still important today.

This is the secret of İbrahim Kaypakkaya's "prophecy": Being revolutionary in practice and Marxism-Leninism-Maoism (MLM)!

However, we cannot say that the theses put forward by this young communist leader were understood and grasped correctly, especially by his followers. Undoubtedly, his followers defended the theses he put forward with a mass mobilization reaching thousands of immortals, tens of thousands of prisoners and hundreds of thousands of supporters and kept Kaypakkaya's name and line alive in the practice of class struggle in our geography. However, they could not overthrow the bourgeois state power, which was his most fundamental issue, and establish the people's power.

Comrade Kaypakkaya, especially Comrade Kaypakkaya, would put an end to the bloodshed, the prices paid and the suffering; They could not achieve the goal of creating a classless and exploitation-free society. This concrete situation stands in the middle as a fact, first and foremost for Kaypakkaya's party.

The main reason for not achieving this goal is neither paying the price as it is commonly believed, (many did not hesitate to pay the price), nor the armed struggle (since its establishment, armed struggle has been defended uninterruptedly, highly effective armed actions have been carried out from time to time, guerrilla warfare and its forces have reached a quantity and quality that cannot be underestimated in our geography), nor the masses (which Kaypakkaya's thoughts have affected millions of people in our geography and mobilized hundreds of thousands of people).

The main reason why Kaypakkaya's goal of power could not be brought to the final result is the weakness in grasping his revolutionary method, the inability to apply MLM science. Although his party brought Kaypakkaya's views to millions after his assassination, it failed to respond to the contradictions revealed by the struggle of the masses in the developing course of the class struggle; it was insufficient in the correct solution of these contradictions and in its orientation towards the goal of power.7

Of course, despite these shortcomings and inadequacies, it should be noted that Kaypakkaya's party continues the class struggle in Turkey and the Turkey Kurdistan region, as well as in Rojava. Comrade Kaypakkaya continues to be a flag in the hands, a bullet in the barrel, a slogan in the tongues and to lead the practice of his party on the 50th anniversary of his murder. Our party, despite his absence, continues to pay and pay the price, to labour and lead the class struggle.

Of course, Kaypakkaya is neither an "ordinary" leader in terms of the class struggle in our geography, nor the theses he put forward are "verses of the Qur'an descended from the sky" and in this sense he is a "saint". Kaypakkaya is a young communist leader who, with his shortcomings and strengths, became the leader of the re-emergence of communist thought in our geography after half a century of silence in the Ottoman period and after the M. Suphi's TKP. In his emergence as a communist leader, his understanding of the class struggle, his approach to mass movements and, most importantly, his revolutionary method, through which he constantly improved himself with his approach of "throwing away the old and taking the fresh", are decisive.8 In the emergence of Kaypakkaya's theses, the lessons learned from the class struggle and mass movements are synthesized with MLM science and re-theorized in the reality of our geography. Since the theses he put forward are synthesized with MLM science in the living reality of the class struggle, they are still up to date. Because the class struggle in our geography continues with all its speed and intensity.

Kaypakkaya's emergence as a communist leader cannot be considered and evaluated separately from the historical ground on which his ideas were formed and the MLM science he was fed internationally. Therefore, on the fiftieth anniversary of his immortality, it is necessary to look briefly at the conditions that brought Kaypakkaya into existence.

Reckoning...

Kaypakkaya's emergence as a communist leader cannot be separated from the developments in the international arena and the course of the class struggle in our geography. The emergence of Kaypakkaya and his contemporary revolutionary leaders on the stage of history is parallel to the emergence of a strong wave of anti-imperialist struggle against the US imperialist invasion of Vietnam.

The development of popular movements around the world, which started in the second half of the 1960s and reached its peak in the 1970s, the revolts and uprisings of the oppressed peoples, especially in Asia and the Middle East, also affected the class struggle in Turkey and Turkey Kurdistan and found an echo among the student youth. Under these conditions, the youth becomes politicized to a significant extent. Democratic people's revolutions and socialism emerge as a hope of salvation for this politicized youth.

Another development that affected all movements internationally was the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution launched in the second half of the 1960s in the People's Republic of China under the leadership of Mao Zedong. The effects of this revolution went beyond the borders of China and had a direct impact on the world revolutionary struggle.

When a series of developments from 1968 to the 1970s in Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan, from the Great Workers' Resistance of June 15-16 to the peasants' occupation of land, were added to this historical process, the politicized youth became more attentive to the problems and class struggle of the working class and working people.

The developments in the international and national arena led to the establishment of and struggle of revolutionary organizations, which would later be called the "armed revolutionary outbreak of '71". The revolutionary leaders of the revolutionary outbreak of '71 questioned organizations such as the TKP, which existed and spoke in the name of the left and socialism before them, and their practice. Revolutionary youth were first influenced by reformist parties such as the TİP. However, developments bring about the revolutionary youth questioning reformism, all kinds of legalism and parliamentarism, etc. and overcoming them in a short time. The 1971 revolutionary leaders came to terms with the past and realized a historical rupture. The 50-year revisionist, parliamentarist and legalist line was overcome by coming to terms with the revolutionary line of '71 revolutionism.

Kaypakkaya is also among the revolutionary leaders of '71. The other revolutionary leaders of the armed revolutionary outbreak of '71, who were his contemporaries, were revolutionaries in practice, just like him.9

This is where the feature that distinguished Kaypakkaya from the revolutionary leaders of his contemporaries and gave him his communist characteristic came into play. He

was a Maoist. His defense of Maoism, the Marxism-Leninism of our time, fundamentally distinguished him from other revolutionary leaders. It is important to note that the theses Kaypakkaya put forward were synthesized with the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist worldview of the social practice he lived and took part in.

Kaypakkaya, like other revolutionary leaders, was influenced by the rising revolutionary wave of '68, he personally took part in the effects of this wave in the geography of Turkey and Turkish Kurdistan and synthesized the lessons he learned from this practice with MLM science.

This is not an arbitrary determination, on the contrary, it is a qualitative distinction that differentiates Kaypakkaya from other revolutionary leaders who emerged in his historical period. Therefore, without giving justice to this fact, the source of the theses Kaypakkaya put forward with the lessons he learned from the class struggle and social practice cannot be revealed.

Unlike other revolutionary leaders, Kaypakkaya was influenced by Chairman Mao's message "Peoples of the World, Unite and Defeat the US Aggressors and All Their Dogs Let loose in the World "10 . This process was unquestionably influential and increasingly decisive in shaping Kaypakkaya's ideological line. As a matter of fact, the ideological hurricane of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in the international arena that shook the world and the integration of this hurricane with the class struggle in Turkey created his ideological-political line.11

Synthesizing the lessons he learned from practice with MLM science and applying them to the class struggle in our geography was the decisive issue that distinguished him from other revolutionary leaders and gave him his communist character.12

Kaypakkaya took part in the '71 revolutionary leaders' reckoning with the past with his own stance and character. However, the most fundamental feature that distinguishes Kaypakkaya from the '71 armed revolutionary leaders' reckoning with what was "presented to them" is that he represented the "rupture within the rupture" of '71 and constituted the communist face of the revolutionary break of '71.

Rupture

Kaypakkaya means "rupture within the rupture". While the revolutionary leaders of '71 broke with what was presented to them in the name of revolutionism and went outside the "established order", especially through armed struggle, Kaypakkaya was not content with this, he also made a break on the theoretical and ideological level. Unlike other revolutionary leaders of his time, Kaypakkaya is known and defended for the theses he put forward on Kemalism and the national question.13 When a general and rather superficial evaluation is made, the first "differences" expressed are the thoughts he put forward on these issues.

However, to limit oneself to these views when it comes to Kaypakkaya is to do injustice to Kaypakkaya's systematic views. Of course, Kaypakkaya's theses on these issues are important points of distinction and concrete expressions of his communist character. However, they are only examples of his communist character. Therefore, to accept Kaypakkaya as "correct" only with his views on Kemalism and the national question means to detach these views from his ideological line in total, from the systematic

integrity of his views. This means incompletely grasping Kaypakkaya's communist line, failing to see the dialectic in his ability to put forward these views.

For example, the analysis of Kemalism is not only an "evaluation of history" but also of decisive importance for those involved in the class struggle in terms of the structure and ideological formation of the state of the ruling classes. An incomplete or erroneous evaluation in this regard, in the final analysis, carries the danger of the evaluators being backed up by any clique of the ruling classes in the name of "progressivism".

Therefore, it is necessary to comprehend and defend Kaypakkaya's views in their totality. Accepting his views on Kemalism or the national question as correct and rejecting MLM science, which is decisive in putting forward these views, means rejecting Kaypakkaya's roots. Because it is necessary to evaluate and deal with his views on Kemalism together with his views from his understanding of the party to the approach to the revolutionary struggle of the masses, from the structure of the state to the armed struggle.

Secondly, Kaypakkaya's theses on Kemalism and the national question are not only an analysis of the state but also a thesis on history. History was taken from the hands of the Turkish regime and given to the workers and laborers as a weapon.14

Thirdly, in the context of Kemalism and the national question, he points to the two Achilles' heels of the regime and points to these issues, which are among the main contradictions of the class struggle in our geography.15

On the other hand, Kaypakkaya's theses must be taken together with his understanding of the party. A series of issues that Kaypakkaya discussed with the organization he was involved in, from the name of the communist party to the issue of the leadership of the working class, etc., are the issues that fundamentally distinguish him from the revolutionary leaders of '71 and enable him to represent the "rupture within the rupture".16

The lessons Kaypakkaya drew from the practice itself, from the Great Workers' Resistance of June 15-16, brought about his break with the organization he was in.17

Kaypakkaya's transcending the organization with the lessons he learned from practice is not only a natural consequence of his revolutionary method, but also important in terms of showing the differences between him and other revolutionary leaders of his contemporaries, and the revolutionary and holistic nature of his thoughts.18

Kaypakkaya put forward theses that remain valid today, not only on the democratic people's revolution but also on issues such as socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat.19

Kaypakkaya both criticized the organization he was in and clarified his break with other revolutionary leaders in terms of his understanding of revolution, the leadership of the working class, etc. with the lessons he learned from practice.20

These lessons also reveal his difference from the revolutionary leaders of '71, despite their common ground of armed struggle. Kaypakkaya not only defended that the revolution would be based on violence, but also argued that this violence should be based on the masses, not a handful of intellectual groups. This is one of the qualitative points of distinction that separates Kaypakkaya from the revolutionary leaders of '71 in terms of armed struggle.

Kaypakkaya, while breaking with the revolutionary leaders of '71, does not only remain on a theoretical level. He also realizes this break on a practical level. Together with his comrades, he founded the Communist Party of Turkey-Marxist Leninist and its military organization, the Workers' and Peasants' Liberation Army of Turkey, as well as the Marxist Leninist Youth Union of Turkey.21

In conclusion, the theses Kaypakkaya put forward while realizing the "rupture from the rupture" have a holistic character. His thesis of history, his understanding of revolution, his style of work and organization and his understanding of the party are the product of a dialectical approach. To the extent that this dialectic is grasped Ibrahim Kaypakkaya, Turkey revolutionary and communist movement opened for the "new path" can be grasped and understood.

A New Path

History and class struggle proved the scientificity of Kaypakkaya's theses. And it continues to prove it. The course of the class struggle and the results of social struggles in the fifty years that have passed since his assassination amply demonstrate this. Kaypakkaya was thrown into the fire of the class struggle with his whole being in the historical time and place where he lived and struggled. In a short period of time, he said what had not been said until then and did what had not been done. He also defended what he did.22

"Servat reliquias igni comburuntur." (He who stays in the fire serves the fire.)23 In this fire of the class struggle, he kindled the fire that had been dying out until his time, and in this fire of the class struggle he formed the theses that still guide his party half a century later.24

It is because he formulated his theses within the practice of the class struggle that these theses are still relevant and important for the class struggle today.

This importance is twofold. Although half a century has passed for the Turkish ruling classes, Ibrahim Kaypakkaya is still a dangerous torch that cannot be extinguished or hidden despite all their efforts; he is a guiding light for the struggle for freedom, independence and socialism of the working class and working people of Turkey.

In this sense, Kaypakkaya's views are like a "shirt of nessus". Seeing Kaypakkaya as a communist leader and walking on the new path he opened in line with his views means confronting the Turkish ruling classes and their ideology from the front, it means a breathless war.

Kaypakkaya means defending the interests of the working class and the working poor peasantry, organizing them and fighting for democratic popular power and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Kaypakkaya means being the voice and defender of all oppressed groups, the Turkish-Kurdish nations and various minority nationalities and beliefs.

Kaypakkaya means being from oppressed and ignored beliefs, especially Alevis, and fighting for freedom of belief.

Kaypakkaya means being from oppressed nations and minority nationalities, especially the Kurdish nation in our geography, and being the unconditional defender of the Right to Secede Freely.

Kaypakkaya means being the organization of the Armenians, Greeks and Syriacs who were subjected to genocide.
Kaypakkaya means being a woman, being LGBTI+ and being in the middle of the struggle against the patriarchal system.
Kaypakkaya means being the sound of the streams, the echo of the mountains, the voice of the plains, which are plundered and plundered for the sake of capitalist rent.
Kaypakkaya means being the voice of the "voiceless" street animals and all living things.
Kaypakkaya means; "to be the carer for outcasts"; to be the enemy of the oppressor, exploiter, profiteer, harasser and rapist, and to be the enemy of fascism, feudalism, racism, chauvinism, patriarchy, imperialism and all kinds of backwardness...
Being Kaypakkaya on the 50th anniversary of his immortality means taking part in the vast sea of the class struggle by using his revolutionary method of "throwing away the stale and taking the fresh "25 and "replacing the old shirt with a new and clean shirt "26 and engaging with the revolutionary, democratic struggle of the oppressed masses, big and small, and channeling it into the river of the People's Democratic Revolution.
Kaypakkaya, who constituted the communist face of the '71 outburst of the revolutionary movement in Turkey and who threw himself into the fire of class struggle with all his being by saying "Aut viam inveniam aut faciam" (Either we will find a way or we will make a way)27 , started his struggle by "taking off his old shirt and putting on clean clothes". Fighting against the old, rotting, stale, status quo, dogmatism, he appeared on the stage of history by "bombing the bourgeois headquarters".
The first step in understanding and commemorating Kaypakkaya is to grasp his method. Wherever we are, in whatever area or region we live, if we have taken our side with the working class and oppressed peoples, the first thing we must do is to take part in the mobility of the masses, to enter the class struggle with our whole being. Our priority must be to draw revolutionary conclusions from the struggle of the masses and raise it to revolutionary struggle.
The greatest evil to be done to Kaypakkaya is to take him dogmatically and make him no longer a weapon to hit the class enemies. In the face of the course of history and class struggle, such understandings have no validity. Because; Kaypakkaya's theses put forward for the revolution in Turkey, they should not be turned into a neglected rusty weapon that will blow up in the face of those wielding it and with that distance itself from the struggle of the masses, distilled from the realities of the revolution in Turkey.
Kaypakkaya's revolutionary method and MLM science is to take part in the revolutionary struggle of the masses and synthesize these struggles with MLM science: Here is the source of the "miracle", Kaypakkaya's "secret" and the guarantee of our victory!
Undoubtedly, for this very reason,as long as the class struggle, the working class and the oppressed peoples exist, as long as the science of the international proletariat lives, Kaypakkaya's theses will continue to be dangerous for the ruling classes and will continue to guide the working class and the oppressed peoples.
As long as the world of private property and class struggle exists, Kaypakkaya will live and fight. As long as the masses, the class struggle and the party exist, this young communist leader with a torn and patched brown cap will continue to live and fight!

Footnotes

1- Prosecution Statement dated January 29, 1973

2- "Kaypakkaya's ideas are the most dangerous in the communist struggle in Turkey at the present time. The views he presents in his writings and the methods of struggle he envisages, we can say without hesitation that they aim for the implementation ofrevolutionary communism." (TKP-ML case file, MIT report, 1973)

3- Moreover, Kaypakkaya is aware of this situation: "Now we know well that our judgments on Kemalism will make all bourgeois and petty bourgeois organizations and currents, from Çetin Altan, D. Avcıoğlu, İlhan Selçuk to the TİP, M. Belli, H. Kıvılcımlı, TKP, THKP-THKC, THKO and Şafak revisionists, jump up in anger."

4- Today, these counter-revolutionary attacks have been added to the "discussions that Kaypakkaya was not killed in torture". Such a discussion is of course unnecessary, but it is not innocent. Our party has never embraced Kaypakkaya only and only as "a leader who did not give a secret". Our party saw and propagandized Kaypakkaya as the leader who reorganized the communist line in our country; He considered and evaluated the propaganda that Kaypakkaya was only a "valiant revolutionary" who resisted torture as a product of incomplete or faulty understanding of his communist line.

Kaypakkaya was murdered by the class enemies because he was the representative of MLM science in our country. The opposite is also true. Kaypakkaya's not making concessions to the class enemies and his murder is the direct result of his communist identity.

5- Aside from his other theses, Kaypakkaya, while expressing and condemning with a distant foresight that the TİİKP revisionism in which he was involved for a period and the representative of this line, Doğu Perinçek, was an incorrigible dominant nationalist; It is not a prophecy that this person foresees the position in which the line he represents is anchored today after 50 years has passed, but his class attitude and MLM approach to extremely important issues such as Kemalism and the national question.

6- Of course Kaypakkaya was a human being like everyone else. But he was a "special kind" of person, similar to what Stalin said about the Bolsheviks. He was a talented and intelligent person. His fellow fighters of the time say that he loved reading and research and had a keen talent for abstraction. We also know that he was interested in poetry and literature, especially folk culture, wrote poetry, was interested in music and was a "poet".

7- These statements are not pretentious. On the contrary, by expressing the truth on a revolutionary basis, it is aimed to raise the struggle for power on the right ground. The party has a leader like Kaypakkaya and his communist heritage. This heritage will develop and strengthen as much as it can unite with the struggle of the masses "stronger than the atomic bomb", take part in these struggles, and solve the problem of power, which is its ultimate goal.

8- It can be said that Kaypakkaya's greatest enemy is himself! The dogmatic approach that cannot comprehend the revolutionary method of this young communist leader and sees the theses he put forward as unchangeable taboos is the greatest enemy of him and his communist legacy. On the 50th anniversary of his immortalization, if one does not respond to the current contradictions of the class struggle and if one does not use

Kaypakkaya's revolutionary method in accordance with current contradictions, then "defending Kaypakkaya" means not understanding his emergence as a communist leader and his constant reproduction and reproduction of himself.
9- Not only that, the revolutionary leaders of '71 were defending armed struggle. They were murdered by fascism because they practiced what they advocated.
10- In this message published on May 20, 1970, the determination that "Imperialists are paper tigers", which was widely known and used in later years, was also made.
11- As a matter of fact, by saying "Our movement is the product of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution", Kaypakkaya clearly reveals that the ideological line of the party he founded is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism.
12- The reason why Kaypakkaya took part in the ranks of the Proleter Devrimci Aydınlık (PDA,Proletarian Revolutionary Luminary), which seemed to be on the "right" among the Dev-Genç leaders of the period, was that he trusted the revolutionary action of the masses, not the coup of a group of vanguards or the army of the order. However, Kaypakkaya left this structure by overcoming the revisionist, pacifist PDA line and founded the TKP-ML with his comrades.
Today, although there are lines that evaluate Kaypakkaya as a communist and see him as a leader, Kaypakkaya cannot be defended without defending Marxism Leninism, which gave Kaypakkaya his communist character, and the science of Maoism, which is its highest stage today. Our party defends Kaypakkaya as the communist leader of MLM science in Turkey, Turkey Kurdistan and the Middle East geography.
13- Kaypakkaya's first article is the article "National Issue in Turkey" dated December 1971, in which he evaluated the Kurdish national question. His article analyzing Kemalism is "The Theses of Dawn Revisionism on the Kemalist Movement, the Period of Kemalist Power, the Second World War Years, the Post-War Period and May 27th".
14- Kaypakkaya is aware of the importance of this weapon in his theses: "Communists know very well how to turn history into a weapon in the revolutionary struggle. ... Communists know how to turn history into a weapon in the revolutionary struggle.... There are some weapons that those who wield them have an invincible power. For example, Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.
There are some weapons that injure those who hold them: That is, the weapon backfires and hits those who hold it. Kemalism is such a weapon!"
15- In the context of Kemalism, "the contradiction within the ruling classes" is among the main contradictions according to TKP-ML's 1st congress, while in the context of the national question, "the contradiction between the oppressor nation and the oppressed nation and nationalities" was among the main contradictions in TKP-ML's 1st Congress (2019).
16- Kaypakkaya expresses his understanding of the party in his article titled "Critique of the TIIKP Program Draft" (January 1972).
17- After this rupture, he wrote the article "The Origin and Development of the Differences Between Us and Dawn Revisionism, General Criticism of TİİKP Revisionism" in June 1972. After breaking away from the TİİKP, he quickly laid the foundations of a new organization.
18- Kaypakkaya clearly expresses that he is aware of this with the following words: "The Great Workers' Resistance of June 15-16 and the martial law that followed created

an important leap in the consciousness of some cadres. These friends learned important lessons from the workers' movement and the difficult days of struggle that followed."
19- Kaypakkaya; "Although there are classes in socialist society and the state as the instrument of dictatorship of the proletariat, there is neither exploitation nor oppression. Exploitation disappears with the construction of socialism. The principle is: "From each according to his strength, to each according to his labor". To speak of exploitation in a society where everyone receives according to his labor shows a lack of understanding of this principle. Oppression, on the other hand, will disappear even with the realization of democratic people's power (which is a people's republic). In other words, there is no oppression in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat or in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. ... It is true that the world of communism will be "a world without classes". But it is not just that. In the world of communism, along with classes, the state, which is the product of irreconcilable class contradictions, which is the instrument of oppression of the ruling classes over the other classes, which is the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat under socialism, will also disappear. Because, with the complete disappearance of classes, the proletariat will no longer need the state. On the other hand, at the stage of communism, that is, "when the slavish submission of individuals to the division of labor, and with it to the contradiction between head and arm labor, comes to an end; when labor becomes not only a means of subsistence, but itself the first vital necessity; when the productive forces increase with the development of individuals in their various forms, and when all the sources of collective wealth gush forth in abundance, only then... will society be able to write on its flags: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!" (Marx)." (from Critique of the Draft Program of the TIIKP, January 1972, Part II)
20- The lessons he drew from the Great Workers' Resistance of June 15-16 are remarkable in this sense. For example; "The workers' movement, firstly, showed that the revolution will be based on violence, that it is necessary and inevitable.... Secondly, the workers' movement dealt a heavy blow to the bourgeois theories of the state. It showed what a foolish dream it is to expect the liberation of the people from the army of the ruling classes.... Thirdly, the Great Workers' Resistance of June 15-16 showed once again that the real heroes are the masses. And it dealt a heavy blow to the individualist petty-bourgeois currents that dreamed of revolution based on a handful of elite intellectual groups..."
21- In addition to these side organizations, the Party announced the establishment of the Communist Women's Union (KKB) at its 1st Congress (2019).
22- "I did all this for the sake of Marxist-Leninist thought, which I sincerely believe in. And I do not regret the result. Never regretted it. I worked for this cause by risking all kinds of consequences and foreseeing a struggle at the cost of my life, and as a result I was captured." Kaypakkaya, prosecution statement dated April 21, 1973.
23- A Latin expression
24- The Party incorporated Kaypakkaya's theses, expressed as programmatic views, into a program at its 1st Congress (2019). The Party Program was based not only on Kaypakkaya's theses but also on his "defense draft", the last article he wrote before he was murdered.

25- "The Main Points of Divergence with Dawn Revisionism", from the February Resolution of the WABK
26- Critique of the Draft Program of the TIIKP, January 1972, from Part II
27- Latin phrase said by Hannibal Barca (247 BC-183 BC) in response to Carthaginian commanders who said that it was impossible to cross the Alps with elephants

Ibrahim Kaypakkaya is Alive and Fighting!
We Will Win With Fifty Years of Experience and Accumulation!
Long live our party TKP-ML, our people's army TIKKO, our women's organization KKB and our youth organization TMLGB
Long live Marxism-Leninism-Maoism!

TKP-ML Central Committee
January 2023